

## REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thoroughness with which the Examiner has examined the above-identified application. Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

### Drawings Objections

The Examiner has objected to Figs. 2-10 and 12-14 as being unreadable. Applicants have submitted under separate cover a set of formal drawings to replace the informal drawings currently in the file in order to address the Examiner's objections. Applicants are sending these formal drawings to the draftsman.

### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has objected to claims 11 and 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and if rewritten or amended to overcome the claim limitations set forth in the office action. Applicants have rewritten independent claim 31 to include all the limitations of claim 1 and claim 11, and have added claims 32-34, dependent therefrom. Applicants have also added new claim 35 to include all the limitations of claim 1 and claim 15, and have added

claims 36 - 38, dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are in a condition for allowance.

### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 23 because of the following informality: the phrase "allowing said user ...", needs clarification. The Examiner suggests the following, "said user and other users." Applicants concur, and have amended claims 1 and 23 accordingly.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-10, 12-14, and 16-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Frank, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,907,589). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Frank describes a method for evaluating vias, per pad, in an electronic design. One or more via per pad design rules are formulated, and the electronic design is then processed to determine whether the vias of the electronic design violate the via per pad design rules. In the event of a violation, an indicator is generated to identify the non-conforming vias. Frank, col. 3, ll.52-65. Importantly, Frank does not display the output as part of a software layer of the design tool such that no permanent changes are made to any original design file. In this manner, Frank is silent regarding, and does not teach of, generating an output file that allows the user to save information related to identified violations in order to share the information with a designer or other user, as is performed by the present invention. Specification, p.8, ¶

0037. In the present invention, the original file is preserved, and the creation of a subset file is repeatable for multiple, unique output files. Specification, p.8, ¶ 0037.

Where a violation contains a main description 16 and a secondary feature related to the violation 23, both highlighting of the main feature 25 and highlighting and/or the drawing of a small box around the secondary feature 24 can be performed. This is shown in Figure 4. If a bounding region is pertinent to the violation, a bounding box of prescribed distance may be drawn around the key feature 26. Fig. 5 depicts a bounding box around the region. In this example, a box is drawn around a component pin at a distance from all sides of the pin. If the violation relates to the lack of a desired feature that should be located within a region, a bounding box representing the checked region may be drawn 28, as depicted in Fig. 6. ... This output file is created with the "save line" software button 21 on the main pop-up window 11 as shown in Fig. 7. Once created, the subset output 9 may be viewed graphically within the design tool.

Specification, p.10, ¶ 0044.

Frank simply gives a text report summarizing via per pad violations. Frank, Figs. 4 and 8A (item 221). In relation to the example given above, Frank does not create a bounding region pertinent to a violation, graphically showing a bounding box around the identified key feature. As depicted in Figs. 2-6 of the present invention, the design rule violation is identified and graphically displayed on a layout with a bounding box surrounding the area of interest. Thus, Frank does not teach, disclose, or suggest displaying the output as part of a software layer of the design tool such that no permanent changes are made to any original design file. This "software layer" is not simply a text list, but rather a graphic presentation of the violation over the original design layout, that ultimately presents the design layout without altering the original file associated with the layout.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, 23 and 29 to delineate this novel feature and to further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art of Frank.

It is respectfully submitted that the application has now been brought into a condition where allowance of the entire case is proper. Reconsideration and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Robert Curcio  
Reg. No. 44,638

**DeLIO & PETERSON, LLC**  
121 Whitney Avenue  
New Haven, CT 06510-1241  
(203) 787-0595